CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1916. Vol. VI.

IN MEMORIAM.

DONALD HANKEY.

The news that Donald Hankey had fallen in action brought to thousands of people who had never seen him—and the present writer was one of these—the kind of poignant sense of loss which is usually associated with the death of an intimate personal friend. It was not merely that one felt that the Church and the nation had lost yet another man of brilliant gifts, who could ill be spared. The real secret of this sense of personal loss lay in the rich humanity, the extraordinary sympathy, the understanding of all sorts of men, which his writing revealed. We can almost apply to him his own description of the relation which came to exist between "The Beloved Captain" and his men in one of the most perfect of all his essays:—

> "There was a bond of mutual confidence and affection between us, which grew stronger and stronger as the months passed."

We felt that we really grew to know him, and we were sure that he knew us through and through. This wonderful insight into human nature gave him the power to speak directly to the human heart. That he was no mean theologian was clear from the fact that though handicapped, by having left school at the age of sixteen for the R.M. Academy at Woolwich, and having subsequently served for six years in the R.G.A., he secured a Second Class in Theology at Oxford. But his great aim, and his great achievement in theology, was the interpreta-

tion in life of the learning of the schools. He sought and he found a gospel for the plain man, educated or uneducated, which took into real account the progress of critical learning. A singularly inept reviewer, in a rationalist paper, jibed at him for saying in *Faith or Fear?*

> "I learnt to reconcile Genesis and the *Origin of Species*, or rather to read the one without being worried by recollections of the other."

On this the reviewer in question triumphantly remarks:—

> "Precisely! Put aside the facts of evolution, and it is quite easy to accept a theory of special creation the day before yesterday, or to mould that theory into a shape which its author could not recognize."

But of course Donald Hankey neither accepted nor moulded any "theory of special creation." He read the first chapters of Genesis, as every Modernist reads them, as the noblest of all creation-myths, and as far more akin to poetry than to science. He had nothing in common with those extraordinarily dull and stupid persons who produce elaborate attempts to "reconcile" the letter of scripture with the teaching of science. He could not have anything in common with them, for he was not stupid, and he never wrote anything that was dull. But though his singular honesty and candour made him ready to recognize and accept whatever results of criticism seemed to him to be assured, he himself was not, and he never professed to be, a critic. He said of himself, in his preface to his first book, *The Lord of all Good Life*—quite the best book, by the way, to put into the hands of the average person seeking for a positive statement of the truth of the Gospel, without ignoring or explaining away real difficulties, in regard, for instance, to miracles,—that he "is not concerned to temper the wind (of criticism) to the shorn lamb," nor anxious to "re-assure" anyone. His object is just to set forth his own honestly thought out faith, and he closes this same preface with this characteristic sentence:—

> "To the laity of the Church of England, to all who in shops, and factories, and barrack-rooms, and messes, and colleges, and hospitals, and ships, and wherever else men are gathered together, are trying to fight the battle of Christ with the poorest of equipment, this book is dedicated in loving fellowship."

There is no need here to repeat the story of his own inner life, since he has told it in his own words in the first of the chapters he contributed to *Faith or Fear?* but it is perhaps worth while pointing out that after he had lost the second-hand beliefs of his childhood, his progress towards a vital and evangelistic personal faith had four distinct phases. First, he came to see the impossibility of accounting for the existence of the human spirit from the rationalist standpoint. This led him to Theism. He could not stop there. A vivid, personal experience set him seeking for the personal knowledge of Christ. To achieve this he left the Army, and went to Oxford. Oxford, he says, taught him that it was possible to be a Christian without doing violence to his intellectual honesty, but it did not give him "a gospel for ordinary men,' nor did he find this at Leeds Clergy School. But he could be content with nothing less, and he saw that in order to get it he must first know ordinary men. To gain this knowledge he embarked on the adventurous odyssey which really only ended with his death. On this odyssey he learnt the secret that only he can aspire to teach men who is always learning from them. In the Oxford settlement in Bermondsey, in the steerage of a German liner, in the Bush of Australia, in the barrack-room, and in hospital, he learnt to love his fellow-men, and to know them with the insight that is born of love. And in them he found the Christ for whom he sought. He found Him, as indeed the Gospel taught him to find Him, very often unrecognized by those who without knowing it served Him, and very often crucified by those who knew not what they did. And so it was that he read the Gospel in the light cast upon it by his insight into the hearts and the spiritual needs of "the common people," and then, in his first book, he set himself to re-interpret *The Lord of all Good Life* to the men he so passionately loved. He had found now the secret of all vital religious teaching, for he had learnt to read the ancient documents of the Faith in the light of the signs of his own times, and to interpret the signs of the times in the light of the ancient

records. He "searched the scriptures" indeed, but, unlike the scribes and the pharisees, he remembered that from the religious point of view these were valueless except in so far as they led to the recognition of the living Saviour of men.

So he came to teach, like the Master whose loyal disciple he was, "with authority, and not as the scribes." And, as we all know, the war gave to him, just as he seemed to have mastered this secret, what he believed to be his great opportunity. "With the man in the street," he says, "it is not words that count, but deeds." He, who could have had a commission for the asking, humbled himself to enlist with "the common people," to share to the full the drudgery and hardship of the life of the camp and the trenches. He hated war with all his heart. He distrusted, as every sensitive soul must distrust, his own courage. "I am really not at all brave," he once wrote to me, and, in another letter, he described the war as "Hell—with compensations"—the compensations consisting for him mainly in fellowship with men he loved and admired. When he was invalided home from the front, he found his chief relief from the boredom of life in hospital, and, subsequently, in training (after he had accepted a commission, only because in view of the dearth of officers he felt it his duty to do so), by writing his wonderful articles in the *Spectator*, and his share of *Faith or Fear?* In the former, published in book form, with the title *A Student in Arms*, he just wrote of life in the new army as he knew it, and of his comrades and his officers as he knew them. It does not profess to be a religious book, but it is the most religious book yet written about the war. It has none of the ecclesiastical self-consciousness of such a book as *Priests in the Firing Line*. It is religious because, for Donald Hankey, all life was fundamentally religious. It was just this that made life so well worth living, and so well worth laying down in a good cause. For the chaplain this book is not merely a literary delight, it is a storehouse of materials for better sermons than he has ever preached to his men before. For

Donald Hankey, Jesus Christ was really and truly "the Captain of our salvation"—the Beloved Captain—who shares to the full the experiences of His men, asks them to do nothing He would not do Himself, and is with them at every moment, whatever their need may be. He endorsed to the full the teaching of his fellow-contributor to *Faith or Fear?* that Divinity "is that unseen force which is at the back of all human goodness and love." He really believed what many profess to believe without really believing it, that "of ourselves we can do no good thing." Therefore, wherever he found goodness he found God. He would never have assented to such an idea as that propounded by the Bishop of London in his preface to Canon Box's recent book, that the Virgin birth marks the difference between One who is divine and one who would otherwise have been "only a good man," For him "if man is the son of nature he is also" (just in so far as he is truly and fully man) "the son of God, his Father in heaven." As he says in the first Appendix to *The Lord of all Good Life*:—

> "It is only the fact that the Virgin Birth and the bodily resurrection are told of Jesus that makes them appear credible to those who believe in Jesus. In other words, none can be asked to believe that Jesus was the Son of God because He is said to have been born of a virgin, and to have risen bodily from the grave; though it may happen that a person who believes, on other grounds, that Jesus was the Son of God, and is now alive, may feel that the stories of the virgin birth and the resurrection of the body are for that reason either probably, or even necessarily, true. To them the story told by St. Luke will be acceptable. That is to say that though these stories are not evidence of the Divine Sonship of Jesus, they may be regarded as implied by it. Since, however, the Divine Sonship cannot be proved by these stories, it follows that it cannot be disproved by their rejection. It must also be pointed out that the rejection of these stories does not discredit the remainder of the Gospels of which they are a part, because all higher critics are agreed that they are derived from different sources to the rest of the Gospels."

And he concludes this same appendix by saying:—

> "The man who has recognized the freedom of Jesus and has found freedom and power in trying to imitate Him and share His point of view, and by praying in His Name to His Father, and who has found love and fellowship and life as a member of His Body the Church, will not easily doubt either that He was the Son of God, or that He is alive. The man who has not experienced any of these things, nor

recognized them in others, has not understood the foundations of Christianity."

We have quoted this passage at length because, in its fearless honesty, in its sanctified common sense, it is quite typical of all Hankey's theological writing.

No theology which could not stand the test of life had any kind of validity for him. It was a shock to him to find professing Christians unable to face the perils of the trenches and having to be sent back out of the danger zone. Christianity, for him, made men free, as His Master was free, from the tyranny of all external circumstances, and above all, from the tyranny of fear. And always he tested his theory in action. It was wholly characteristic of him that quite deliberately he set himself to discuss the truth about the fear of death. Did men fear death or not? If not, what did they fear? He concluded that most men had no fear of death when they were faced by it, though there was in them a natural physical shrinking from the indignity of wounds and mutilation and physical pain . . . and then having made his observations and written down his conclusions, he went out to test his theories in the thick of the fight . . . He faced death as gallantly as he had faced life, and, true disciple of His Master as he was, he made of death not a defeat, but the final victory of his life.

C. H. S. MATTHEWS.

THE LATE PROFESSOR H. M. GWATKIN.

The death of Henry Melvill Gwatkin, Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge, has made a great gap among the teachers in his University, and the representatives of theological and historical learning in his Church and country. But beyond this, all who knew him personally: who were familiar with his quaint but not inactive figure in the streets of Cambridge, or had listened, even if sometimes ineffectually, to his lectures in Emmanuel or the Divinity Schools,—or had asked his ever ready advice in his study in Scroope Terrace, where he might be found examining minute "beasties," and cats had to be turned out of chairs to accommodate visitors; all his pupils, or those who sought his advice for their pupils or themselves, feel that they have lost an honoured and dear friend. But they may also realize that he left behind him a well accomplished task, and their regrets are tempered with thankfulness at having been permitted to know something of so profound a scholar, and so excellent a man.

Gwatkin's remarkable academic career has been described in most of the obituary notices. He obtained a first-class in Mathematics, Classics, Moral Sciences, and Theology. But it should be added that History, his own special branch of learning, had not at that time an honours examination to itself, and that his pet hobby was a branch of natural science: a department of conchology. During a tour I once made in the East, with a friend who had a commission to bring home certain specimens of snails (of which an unusual breed flourishes in the ruins of Ephesus), we managed to secure for Professor Gwatkin the palates of such of the snails as could be preserved alive,—and some photographic views of the sites of some of the earliest Church Councils. The breadth of his interests and knowledge—the happy blend of scientific, literary, and philosophic habits of thought, enriched his teaching in every kind of work which he took up. In Cambridge, after Dr. Creighton became Bishop of Peterborough in 1891, he was

appointed Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History. In this sphere he most ably continued the tradition begun by Professor Creighton, of presenting the subject as a branch both of theological and of historical studies. The lamentable ignorance of general history sometimes shown in works supposed to deal with the history of the Church, and the equally deplorable confusion of mind as to theological movements often found in ordinary history books, had no excuse in the teaching either of Creighton or of Gwatkin. In this respect, their influence was like that of Hatch and of Bigg at Oxford.

Though there were many subjects belonging to historical and theological knowledge on which Gwatkin could discourse effectively, he generally seemed most at home in the Early Middle Ages—the times of the break-up of the Empire and the Barbarian Settlements. He seemed to have a mastery of an almost hopeless complication of facts. Every character stood out for him in distinct, human relations. One felt that his broad generalizations and even his unconcealed likes and dislikes were based not on personal predilections but on minute examination of all available sources. In dealing with a limited period, such as the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, and the settlement of the Franks in Gaul, he guided his pupils to the principles by which history is built up. When he took a wider sweep, he removed from their minds the difficulty of seeing the wood for the trees. Perhaps his most characteristic class was his "revision" of General Mediaeval History. He divided the whole period into six or seven chronological sections, and set four or five questions on each. The class (men and women) brought written answers. Walking up and down Emmanuel Hall, he held out his hands for the papers, timidly pushed forward or occasionally hidden by the writers. Seizing one or two, he held each in turn to his better eye, and pronounced at once on the points taken or missed in the answer. Then he gave briefly a clear statement of the points that *ought* to have been taken, and passed on to the next answer.

The breadth with minuteness, the subtle humour, and the intense delight in his subject, characterized his theological as well as his historical lectures. In fact his mind was essentially theological and historical at the same time. It is remarkable that—especially in his later years—his physical disabilities: defect of sight and of hearing and great imperfection of articulation (or rather, perhaps, a peculiarity of intonation), would have been fatal to any but a first-rate teacher. To these was to be added an occasional absence of mind. I remember how on one occasion he waited about a quarter of an hour in the wrong room while his class awaited him in the right room, until they decided to send out a search party. But even if some of his pupils found his idiosyncrasies sometimes a little trying, those who persevered were amply rewarded, both in the teaching they received from him, and in the sympathetic and stimulating advice he gave to them in private interviews.

He had a very curious and characteristic way of compressing what he wanted to say. His post-cards, written in a curious, neat, but twisted hand, are a curiosity. I had once complained of the extremely quarrelsome character of a sect he had desired me to investigate. In his post-card he said:

> "Yes, they were cantankerous beasties, but all beasties are interesting, especially when they are damnable heretics."

The use of the word *beasties* does not imply intolerance, as with him it was almost a term of endearment.

But apart from his services to Church history, in teaching it humanely and comprehensively, has Professor Gwatkin a claim to the regard of Modern Churchmen? He would have disliked any direct associations with a particular society within the English Church, yet his influence was all for breadth and freedom. In some respects, he may be said to have had a conservative bias. In his Gifford Lectures on *The Knowledge of God*, while one admires his wide reading, his trenchant style, his brilliant historical sweeps, and his occasional passages of surpassing eloquence, one is a little disappointed that he

seems to cling to old-fashioned views as to New Testament criticism. But he never wished his position to be taken as final. In one passage he writes of the old Broad Churchmen.[1]

> "They had as much of piety, and as little of mannerism as any men, a true regard for law and order without slavery to forms and fashions, and above all, their love of truth was void of fear. . . . Like the Alexandrians and the Cambridge Platonists, Maurice and his friends felt that the current conceptions of God were unworthy, and needed all the resources of human thought and feeling to widen them, and make them fit to represent Christ's teaching. Width was their aim, and it must be ours."

A few of Professor Gwatkin's hearers were shocked at his denunciation of the Church of Rome. It is, however, to be observed that he was not without full admiration for the learning and piety that have flourished within its borders. One regretted sometimes that he should speak of the Mass as idolatrous, when there were Romanists in his classes. But he certainly would not have stigmatized every good Romanist as an idolator. With all his enthusiastic recognition of the majesty of the Roman Empire and Roman Law, his soul revolted against the legalist and materialistic elements which the Empire had handed on to the Roman Church. Where Roman ecclesiastical materialism was defended without any valid pretention to the old Roman dignity and claims, he felt a withering contempt which he vented without scruple. It is on this ground that he came forward as a doughty defender of the principles acknowledged by the Churchmen's Union against the spirit of exclusiveness in the Anglican Church. His *Open Letter in Reply to the Open Letter of the Bishop of Oxford*, is a controversial pamphlet, worthy, for trenchancy and delicacy, of the pen of Pascal. It may be observed that Gwatkin's personal esteem for the Bishop comes out all through, and removes any suspicion of personal or narrow feeling. One sentence in particular shows both his naturally conservative attitude in doctrine, and his thirst for more light.

> "The Creeds have no independent authority, they seem like the outlines of history or astronomy: I cannot imagine them disproved; but I can very well imagine them transformed by new light into some-

[1] *Knowledge of God*, ii. 324-5.

thing very different from what we now mean by them. The Creed was not disproved when we learned that the making of heaven and earth was a work of ages, or that the heaven into which our Lord ascended is not locally above our heads. I do not expect that the Article on the Resurrection will undergo a similar transformation; but it may. Sound criticism is as truly a divine revelation as Scripture itself, and we shall fail in our duty to Him who is the truth if we foreclose the question."

In some of his writings, Prof. Gwatkin shows himself so safe in his theological position as to be able to indulge in sallies that a timid man might regard as dangerous; thus in his excellent little collection of passages from the Early Fathers, where he gives part of the dialogue between Justin and a pagan, he breaks off at a pagan objection without giving the saint's reply—not, apparently, with the object of making the pagan have the best of the argument, but in order to set his readers thinking for themselves. Similarly, having proved in his numerous writings on Arianism his entire sympathy with the Catholic side, he was not afraid to publish, in the *Cambridge Mediaeval History*, a remarkable map to illustrate the Council of Nicaea, and show how far it fell short of being universal.

His last utterance, made within two months of his death, was worthy of him as patriot, as controversialist, and as Christian. A Swedish clergyman had written to him urging the common arguments for Peace. In a letter afterwards published in *The Nation* and in the *Cambridge Review*, he took up the defence of England's position. By a brief statement of carefully assorted facts, he disproved the "neutral" opinion that the war was of England's own seeking and that her methods were as inhuman as those of the Germans. At the end, he made a profession of his optimism, grounded not on desire but on faith, with which this notice may well conclude:—

"By the perplexity and distress of nations, we know that some glorious mystery is now revealing. God keep you, sir, and guide us all, and cleanse our hearts to see and to receive it. My own work must now be nearly done; but I believe and verily trust that our children and our children's children will see a better, a nobler, and a more Christian Europe rising from the ashes of the old."

ALICE GARDNER.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Can the Church of England Repent?

The *Daily Chronicle* published recently an Open Letter to the Bishop of London which deservedly attracted considerable attention. It voices, but in forcible and unconventional language, what is being said again and again, and with increasing energy. The writer affirms that the lack of religious enthusiasm, of which the Bishop of London complains, in preaching the National Mission, is not due chiefly to ignorance or apathy, but to a profound disbelief in the form of religion which the Bishop of London and other traditional Christians are presenting to the nation.

He writes:—

"It is because their religion is not so real to them as the religion of Wesley and Booth was to them. Why is it not so real? Because it is no longer a true religion. Wesley's religion is true no longer. Booth's religion is true no longer. Newman's religion is true no longer. What has happened? The human race has gone on.

"It is now impossible—I beg you to think of the word—impossible for the mass of men to believe your scheme of religion. It is not a question of indifference. It is not a matter of intellectual pride. It is simply that Time has marched and the Church has stood still. The clergy cling to their tradition, manfully, finely, in some instances with great intellectual cleverness. But no one was ever enthusiastic about a tradition. Truth, and truth alone, the ultimate, sovran, and supreme truth, alone floods the cold brain of a man with divine enthusiasm.

"Your religion is not great enough for the world. It is not grand enough for life. It does not fit the facts of human destiny.

". . . You must begin all over again. Don't attempt a revival. A fresh revelation has come to earth. The friar's habit won't serve you. Imitation of any kind will not serve you. You must begin it over again—begin from the very moment when an Eternal God becomes to you a tremendous Reality—the only Reality.

"Have you read a little book called *Faith or Fear?* It is styled an Appeal to the Church of Ehgland, and is written by Churchmen as a prelude to your National Mission. It calls upon the clergy to repent—to repent of saying what they are not perfectly sure is true. It teaches that to say what is not true is a sin, and a dangerous sin. One of the writers, whose pen glows when he speaks of the glorious devotion to truth which men of science have shown in all ages, says this of the Church—that it is no longer a city set on a hill 'to bear witness to the

salvation men's hearts desire, to the Eternal Truth in which every truth of ours is fulfilled, to beauty, and to love' . . . but that it appears to many as 'a fortress set about with walls behind which its craven defenders find their last refuge from a conquering world.' It is a Churchman who says this.

"Faith or Fear?

"Which is it to be?

"Faith in a living God, a glad, a triumphant, an unshakable faith in a God Who is Eternal Law. Whose gift of Eternal Life is to be taken or denied, a God Who has never deserted His creature man, Whose Divine Spirit has shown Itself again and again in holy men, and Whose purpose exceeds all that our wildest dreams can imagine; this—or fear, a craven fear that our tradition is giving way here, tottering there, and tempting the infidel everywhere, and so must be patched up? Which is the path of enthusiasm—Faith or Fear?

"Consider this, my dear Bishop: In the midst of a world-conflagration, which shakes human institutions to their foundations, and reveals to all mankind in a flare of most ruinous destruction the stark realities of everything; here on earth, your Church, your Church which you believe to be a true Church, nay, a Church actually founded by God Himself; this Church setting out to call upon men to repent and setting out to teach men to hope, falls at the very outset into a petty strife as to whether women shall speak in churches.

"What does this show you? Open your eyes—your brave and generous heart is always open—open your eyes and see if God has not written for you across this squabbling threshold of your Mission a lesson, a warning, and a rebuke. God is not only love and goodness. He is truth."

Is it possible for the Church of England to retain within her communion men who feel and think thus? It is obvious that only one type of Churchmanship can possibly retain them; not the Churchmanship of Dr. Watts-Ditchfield, not the Churchmanship of Dr. Gore, single-minded and whole-hearted Christians as these bishops are; but a newer type of Churchmanship, new and yet very, very old, the Churchmanship of Christ. Can the Church of England so simplify and spiritualise her ideals and methods as to embody that ideal of Churchmanship and thereby become once more the spiritual home of the nation? If she is to do that, she requires to undergo a repentance—a change of mind and heart—as hard to accomplish as any ever required of ancient Pharisee and Sadducee. "With God all things are possible," but our heart sinks when we recollect our modern Sanhedrin, the Convocations and Houses of Laymen.

An Englishman's Farewell to his Church.

Thousands of Englishmen every year bid farewell to their Church, but without giving any reasons for their action. An Englishman with rather greater powers of expression and emotion has recently given his reasons in a little book, and if our authorities who sit in our Convocations would condescend to spend an hour in reading it, they would see expressed very nicely what thousands of reverent, educated, high-minded young Englishmen and Englishwomen are feeling to-day about the Church.

Bishop Gore has recently advocated the adoption by the Episcopate of the democratic ideal of government. It may be summarised thus: "Leaders can only go forward when subjected to irresistible pressure from behind."

The Bishop himself, a greater man than his policy, adheres to more primitive episcopal methods of leadership, although obviously longing to secure that sense of support for his more rigorous measures, which steady pressure from behind might afford.

Now if only one hundred thousand young Englishmen would write their farewells to their bishops and post them in envelopes marked "Strictly confidential," it might really awaken their lordships to the secession which is quietly taking place in their midst, and be a way of exerting that needful pressure from behind which is required to make them move in the matter.

We have only space for one little paragraph from our Englishman's farewell, but we think that it will indicate with sufficient clearness its tone and temper:—

> "I am leaving you, my Mother, because I feel you to be dishonest. I am leaving you because I feel your dishonesty to be a wall of stone between the heart of the world and the heart of the Christ. And I am leaving you because I want to live my brief earthly life without unsatisfying compromises and distracting adjustments, my whole spirit given quietly and gladly to the love of God.
>
> "And now I have decided, or, as I dare to think it, God has decided for me, that I can no longer worship at your Altar, nor at that Altar seek any longer the Light of the World. I have made my last Communion. I am taking my farewell of you. And now I am praying

in this porch, through which how many babes have been brought to your font, and how many dead have passed to their burying, that in the greater day to which as all men now feel the Divine Spirit is hurrying us, you may be found calling to your Altar those who would love you now if now you loved truth more than you fear change" (pp. 12, 13*).

Yet we dare to believe that our Englishman would do better if he could only see his way to remain in the Church of his nation, and strive to make it what he believes God would have it become.

Anglican Modernism.

A trumpet-call to Anglican Modernists is sounded by the Rev. Cavendish Moxon in the latest issue of the *Hibbert Journal*. No clearer, stronger, braver statement of Anglican Modernist principles and methods has yet been published.

Modernism implies many things, but its central conviction is the "belief in the present activity of God." Hence, as Mr. Moxon writes:—

> "Modernism is a way of regarding the traditional Christian life, ethics, theology, organisation, and worship from the point of view of believers in the progressive revelation of truth and duty by the Holy Spirit."

For the Anglican Modernist:

> "Christianity is a real development, a creative evolution of life and thought, and a gradually guided escape from illusion and error into the kingdom of truth and goodness."

Dealing with the ultimate test by which Modernist Christianity trys all things, Mr. Moxon is equally clear. That test is love.

> "Modernism by its faith in the supremacy of Christ's spirit of love is also opposed to schism in the sense of an attempt to set up any other test of Catholicity and Churchmanship than conformity with the law of love. Our point of view forbids us either to make a final criterion of the Bible, like some Evangelicals, or of tradition and Councils, like some Catholics, or to reject entirely these authorities, like some Liberal Protestants. We cannot seek the eternal essence of Christianity apart from its living forms of worship, work, and thought; but we cannot give a final authority to any book, creed, ministry, or Church in the past." (p. 93).

Equally clear is Mr. Moxon's teaching on the true bond of unity between Modernists.

---

* *Op. cit.* Published by Mills and Boon, 14, Rupert Street, London, W.C. Price 1/-.

> "It is a common loyalty to the Highest, a common love of truth, goodness, and beauty, a common faith in the Divine character as revealed by the life and work of Christ, a fellowship for the worship of these attributes of God, and for their realisation in all the relations of human life. The religious bond between disciples and God in Christ is the bond of love, and not an agreement with the belief either of the Master or of a majority of his followers. The War has revealed to many the possibility of religious unity without uniformity." (p. 95).

With this ideal before him every Modern Churchman must feel that the National Mission is a call to the National Church to repent in her corporate capacity of her present policy, methods, formularies, whereinsoever they sin against love, freedom, truthfulness, and faith in the inspiration and progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit.

> "If we loved more Him who is the truth, we should refuse to commit the sin of untruthfulness in the very acts designed for His worship." (p. 96).

But true repentance, and this is the difficulty, entails reform, but reform is rendered impossible by the spirit of traditionalism.

"The Spiritual Independence of the Church."

The Dean of Durham contributes a weighty article on "Church and State in England," to the October *Edinburgh Review*. The Dean remarks that for many years past the Church of England has been moving towards some great revolution in status and type, and now the war is visibly hastening the pace of its motion. One of the most sinister signs of this movement is the recent *Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State*. The Dean views both the composition of the committee and its pronouncements with extreme misgiving. In this he certainly has the support of many Liberal Churchmen. The Committee, he urges, is far from being representative of Church feeling, and of Church life. The parochial clergy and the middle classes were practically unrepresented on it. The Committee was of the nature of a *family* party, with the addition of a few dons, lawyers, and labour men, under the paternal chairmanship of Lord Selborne. The report "discloses no adequate grasp of the religious situation,

and contents itself with endorsing the too-familiar programme of an ecclesiastical party." This does not mean the report is not of interest, but only that the plan which it proposes for reconciling Church establishment with Church autonomy is futile. The case of the Scotch Kirk, it is believed, may have helped to mislead the Committee. The Dean believes the religious temperament of the two nations to be fundamentally different.

> "The Scotchman, be his religious description what it may, is always at bottom an ultramontane; the Englishman, under every ecclesiastical label, is essentially an Erastian."

This terse generalisation is calculated to create alarm, when it is recollected that both our Archbishops are Scotchmen.

"The spiritual independence of the Church" which the Committee proposes as the remedy for our present ills, requires in the Dean's judgment to be analysed before being administered to the patient, with the further precaution of first diagnosing the patient's disease.

Once again, it is to be feared, it is a case of putting medicines, of which we know little, into bodies of which we know less. Dean Henson discovers that the medicine was made in Germany. Its main ingredient is "the theory of corporations, put forward in Germany by Dr. Gierke, introduced into England by Professor Maitland, and adapted to the purposes of Tractarian propaganda by Dr. Figgis." Dr. Figgis desires the rulers of the English Church and State to cultivate "the Teutonic polity and habit of mind" in this matter, and to act accordingly. We do not think that because a thing comes from Germany, and is a product of the Middle Ages, it is necessarily pernicious. Our strongest objection to the Report of the Committee is that it shews no real intention of enfranchising the laity as a whole. It wishes to free the Church from the practical control of Parliament, and to deliver it over bound hand and foot to the episcopate. There is no conspicuous advantage in this—except perhaps to the episcopate. Dr. Headlam, a judicious observer, saw recently what this policy had made of the English Church in South Africa. It is not by giving the Church-franchise to

communicants, and by denying it to non-communicants; it is not by giving more power to the Bishops, and less to Parliament, that the Church is going to be made efficient It is reforms, more particularly educational, liturgical, doctrinal, spiritual, and personal reforms which alone can make the Church a power in the nation—and we fail to achieve these reforms, not because of the Church's present connection with the State, but because we are not impressed in many cases with the need for them, and united in our endeavour to secure them. Some of the clergy want Romanism; some want Socialism; some want better pay and pensions; some want more bishops; many want to be let alone; as for the laity, the bulk of them regard the situation as hopeless, and think as the Church cannot reform herself she had better be disestablished and disendowed.

If Churchmen of every kind can only be persuaded that "the spiritual independence of the Church" is going to give to each the dream of his heart, large numbers will soon be clamouring for it. This is the age of patent medicines, and so long as the new medicine has an attractive name, and the advertisement declares that it can cure all diseases, why trouble about an analysis of its contents?

Three Significant Utterances.

The *Challenge* of Dec. 1st publishes three significant utterances by the Master of the Temple, the Rev. J. A. Castle, and Mr. Clutton Brock.

Dr. Barnes, under the heading "Development within the Church," deals very faithfully with the Bishop of Zanzibar's latest book, of which he says:—

> "As a contribution to scholarship it will probably be negligible; as a basis of statemanship it may be positively harmful; as a theological work its characteristic looseness of language, and the persistent presence of veiled metaphor may cause it to be productive of inaccurate thinking, and false conclusions."

But more significant than this criticism is the Master of the Temple's statement with regard to the state of religious feeling in this country.

"Those of us who are in the midst of religious life in England know, as the Bishop of Zanzibar cannot know, that seldom in our history have the religious instincts of the more educated of our people been so strong, or devotion to the Person and ideas of our Lord so inspiring. We wish to widen the Church so as to make those who possess such spiritual strength add to her vitality. We believe that the Catholic faith is no petrified embodiment of the thought of past centuries, but a living expanding inspiration. Further, we see that the attitude to our Lord, and to the Christian life to which modern knowledge and experience lead men may have to be reflected in new interpretations of clauses of the Creeds, and in an emphasis which does not readily harmonise with the temper in which Christianity was perceived and proclaimed by many Greek and Latin fathers."

The Rev. J. A. Castle discusses a well-worn but most important subject, "Some Causes of the Church's Failure." He finds the chief reason for it in the Church's blindness.

"The Church has been blind to the fulness of its divine mission and purpose, to its being the house, the organ, the medium of a progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit for the spiritualisation of the whole life of men."

Hence it comes about that the Church is "moss-bound and moribund;" it is static not dynamic; retrogressive not progressive. It wastes so much time in "the crypts and corridors of past ages;" its theologians are dry-as-dust *dilettanti* collecting dry bones; yet never was there greater need than for theologians to-day who would use to the full the results of our modern scientific, psychological, historical, and other studies, to teach men a true theology. Perhaps worst of all the Church has divorced religion from life.

"We tread the ecclesiastical ground with unfailing regularity, we go through services, we perform religious functions and exercises, we observe days and weeks, and times and seasons, we are obsessed and stake our all upon doctrinalism and externalism, and nobody cares, and nobody listens, and nobody pays any heed or is in the least interested, save, perhaps, fast dwindling congregations. . . . Does this so-called religion touch life? Does it move the great world outside? Is it an incentive to our scientists, to our psychologists, to our philosophers, to the increasing number of educated, intelligent, thinking, and well-read people of all classes, to come and worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth, who is Himself Spirit and Truth."

But Mr. Castle does not write only to condemn. He has a remedy, and he has a vision.

Mr. Clutton Brock lectured at St. Martin-in-the-Fields on Nov. 24th. To his mind the really important religious question to-day is not whether we believe in the Virgin Birth, but whether it is a fact in any sense whatever that God is Love. Mr. Clutton Brock dared even to think that people within the Church were all the while like the Byzantines who quarrelled about small details of religion when the Turk was at the gate, and soon there was no Church in Constantinople left.

But the lecturer dared even yet more. He warned the bishops against the ecclesiastically-minded layman, because he had noticed that the bishops were very apt to regard the ecclesiastically-minded layman as if he were a representative person.

> "He was representative of nobody. His attitude to religion was that of a connoisseur."

Yet, surely, there is some excuse for the bishops regarding him as representative, seeing that he figures so prominently in the Houses of Laymen.

Bishop Gore's Manual.

Dr. Gore's recent Manual,* *The Religion of the Church*, which was scathingly criticized by the Dean of St. Paul's and the Dean of Durham, and has provided an acrimonious correspondence in the Church press, deserves the attention of Modern Churchmen. The book, as might be expected, is well written, and compresses a great deal of information into very little space. From the point of view of arrangement and literary style, it is a model of what such a Manual should be. The first objection urged against it is that claiming to be a Manual for English Churchmen it only sets forth the Anglo-Catholic type of Churchmanship and ignores all other types. Thus it presents English Church membership as a narrower and more rigorous thing than it really is. Another objection urged against it, is that its teaching is not true to Reformation principles, and that if the type of Churchmanship set forth in it be followed out to

* *The Religion of the Church*, by Charles Gore, D.D. Mowbrays, 1/6 net.

its logical conclusions, it leads its devotee within the portals of the Church of Rome, after he has stopped to refresh himself at such wayside inns as the Society of St. Peter and St. Paul.

The first objection is no doubt true. But how could it well be otherwise? It is only natural that Bishop Gore should believe that his type of English Churchmanship is the only representative and adequate type. It is true that the Church of England houses three religions under one roof, but the religion whose adherents have control of the front-door and the principal apartments in the house must naturally come in time to regard the adherents of the other two types of religion as interlopers, as Dean Swift has so amusingly shewn in his *Tale of a Tub.*

The second objection seems to us unjust. Bishop Gore clearly admits the authority of Holy Scripture as the test of the truth of all Church teaching. He writes:—

> "Do not believe what I say simply, unless you receive the proof of what I tell you from the Holy Scriptures." (p. 15).

The weakness of Bishop Gore's Manual is that its teaching breaks down under the application of his own test. This is conspicuous in his sections dealing with Apostolic Succession and marriage with a deceased wife's sister, but there are also a number of other passages which certainly seem to go beyond Scripture, *e.g.*, "The Eucharist (as it is called) is the great Christian sacrifice." It is always very difficult to condemn pious exaggeration of this kind; but it ought to be condemned because it becomes the mother of superstition, and finally the most dangerous enemy of that of which it believes itself to be the best friend.

The book itself will be interesting to religious Anglicans. It will, no doubt, be given largely by Anglo-Catholic clergymen to the newly-confirmed, but it will do little to win the modern Englishman who is willing to be an English Churchman if he can be shewn good reasons for becoming such. The book takes too little account of modern English ways of thinking and feeling to achieve that. However, Bishop Gore's well-meant endeavour

will not have failed, if it prove an incentive to other types of English Churchmen to try and produce something more adequate and convincing.

Italian Modernism.

The most brilliant and readable of American religious magazines, the *Harvard Theological Review*, publishes two interesting articles on Italian Modernism by Giorgio La Piana and Romolo Murri in its October issue.

La Piana notes mournfully the contradictory misjudgments and appreciations of Italian Modernism. What he thinks is needed is a comprehensive survey of it, and especially an understanding of its historical background and environment. The movement originated with the fall of the temporal power of the papacy, followed by the secularizing of the universities, and the reducing of the Tridentine seminaries to the level of private institutions. This led to the withdrawal from them of those who intended to remain laymen. Thus the seminaries were narrowed, and a widening mental gulf fixed between the layman and the ecclesiastic. The aristocracy which in the days of the temporal power had supplied many of the superior Italian clergy now largely ceased to do so, and men of the lower classes with greater moral force, but less general culture, came more and more into prominence. The Italian clergy have thus become less liberal and more dependent on ecclesiastical authority.

Then the older liberal and patriotic clergy who fought for a united Italy were deliberately excluded by the Papacy from bishoprics, and, above all, from teaching posts in the seminaries after the war. In these seminaries historical and biblical studies were banned, ordinands being trained solely in ecclesiastical theology, morality and law.

After Leo XIII. was firmly established on the Papal throne a far-reaching change was made. Finding Romanism confronted by positivism and the democratic movement, he resolved to reform the education of the clergy, and so fit them to enter into the educational and political life of their

communities from which they had largely withdrawn. Hence arose the politico-social movement and the religious scientific movement within the Roman Church. The Pope held it good policy to patronise the former movement, hoping thereby to win the democracy to obedience to the Papacy, but when this clerical democratic movement insisted on trying to realise Christian rather than Papal ideals, it forfeited the Papal support. As for the religious scientific movement, it even more quickly led its followers into a position which rendered loyalty to traditional Catholicism impossible. Their only solution was to try to subordinate logical contradictions to practical activity. Their ideal was to live (*i.e.*, *act* and *feel*) as traditional Catholics, but to think and teach as scientists and historians.

Their fate was, to be condemned uncompromisingly by the Papacy, and having no lay support, they collapsed. Some resigned and became laymen; others took the Modernist oath. Neither alternative was satisfactory. To organise another Christian Church—free, truthful, loving, reverent—neither Papal nor Protestant—was contrary to their ideal which was opposed to schism, and beyond their powers, for they were without a definite organization, without a definite philosophic system, and without any large popular following. The Italian laity, either sceptic or clericalist, were uninterested or hostile. It was for many of them merely a fight between clerics, the most impossible and incomprehensible class of persons, and the old pure-bred clerical cleric eliminated the new type. Perhaps it was a pity that they could not each have eliminated the other. However, it probably remains for the secularist democratic movement, when it has come to its own, to exterminate the survivors.

But perhaps this is not what lies ahead. The war, even in Italy, is causing moral and spiritual values to rise above material values; this may produce after the war a deep and far-reaching religious revival. This would demand a genius of the type of Mazzini, whom Romolo Murri ironically describes as "preacher of a God whose worshippers have still to be found." The outlook is not hopeful, for as the same writer remarks:—

> "As regards culture and the religious studies which would be necessary to prepare any religious revival, students are lacking. Against similar studies the Church sets her face; and the State, being afraid of getting wrong with theology, has suppressed every kind of scientific teaching of philosophy, or of the history of religion in the lycées and universities."

Romolo Murri's remedy is to try to revive the scientific study of religion in Italy by clubs and by literature, and, if possible, by the formation of a free university of religious studies in Rome which would be in touch with the more living centres in England and America—but he feels that Italy cannot do this without outside help.

The remedy seems remote. Rome has no place for a priesthood educated on modern lines, and it was a mistake for Leo XIII., faced by the pressure of modern thought and modern knowledge, to resort to the homeopathic remedy of modernising the education of ordinands. A large well-drilled body of ritualists, organized and led by a few skilful diplomatists, ought to carry the Lady of the Seven Hills on for several centuries more; the Protestants are believed not to exceed 155 millions at present, and the Secularists are probably as numerous.

THE CHURCH AND RIGHTEOUSNESS.

By Canon J. M. Wilson, D.D., Worcester.

What should the Church of England stand for in the matter of righteousness?

Before indicating an answer to this question, let us first take note of the wide-spread feeling that the nation cannot do without righteousness; that it needs an organ of expression of the moral forces that make for righteousness; and that the National Church ought to be that organ. Christ, the nation is sure, stood for righteousness. The National Church therefore ought to stand for righteousness.

That feeling is of great significance; it indicates a reservoir of Christian motive power, on which we Churchmen must draw

at a time of national spiritual uplifting. At the same time there is an equally wide-spread feeling in the nation that the Church as a whole, and in particular the Church of England, is not, as it now exists, an effective institution for appreciating some of the great forces in it that make for righteousness, or for giving them expression.

This appears to summarise the position. Nevertheless that position is not unhopeful. The attitude of every class, those of the student, the man of affairs, the wage-earner, and now we should add the soldier, towards the Church, is plainly more hopeful than it ever was before.

For it is now no longer the attitude of hostility or contempt. It is the attitude of disappointment, and that makes a great difference. It is felt by all classes; but in particular, and in one special respect, by the wage-earning class of which alone this paper speaks. They miss in us, and in what we seem to stand for, something that is indispensable to their conception of Christianity.

Now that is a hopeful state of things for two reasons: it reveals the prevalence around us of positive ethical ideals of Christianity with which our presentation of it is compared; and the disappointment may be turned into joy, if we can understand those ideals, and welcome them.

Let us then make and examine two suppositions, neither of them impossible: (1) That in that wide-spread ethical ideal of Christianity, latent in the heart of the nation, there is some element which we Churchmen have inadequately grasped; some truth and teaching which is really primary, but which the Church has somehow allowed to appear secondary—let us suppose, in fact, that in answer to centuries of prayer and teaching in the Church, the Holy Spirit of God has been stirring the heart of the nation, and that the answer to our prayers comes, as it generally does, in unexpected form and disguise; and (2) Let us suppose that Churchmen, clerical and lay, can and will bring themselves to listen to that answer, and humbly so to learn; can and will learn to put first what they

have been putting second, and second what they have been putting first. Let us suppose these two things, and then let us ask: Is not this the most splendid opportunity the Church of England has ever had for inspiring the nation?

First, then, what is that ethical truth latent in the nation's heart which we of the Church of England are thought to have inadequately grasped, and to have relegated to a secondary position? It is, in brief, *righteousness between man and man.*

That is at least the deliberate verdict, variously expressed, of those outside us. The Church is regarded by them as not a good example, or even teacher, still less as the champion, of righteousness between man and man, or between class and class; it is not indeed regarded as a serious factor in the efforts, which they deem righteous, to raise the physical, intellectual, and social condition of the poorer class. We may regard at first their verdict as too unqualified, or resent it as unjust, but the verdict it unquestionably is, in substance. The aspirations of Labour for a fuller and better life seem to them to be ruled as outside the Church's ideal and sphere of effort.

Moreover, Churchmen do not seem to the mass of wage-earners, except in the case of a few marked and eccentric individuals, even to attempt or wish to understand the spirit that is stirring them, and in fact Churchmen seriously misunderstand and misrepresent that spirit. We seem not only to stand aside, but to disparage, to oppose.

Those who speak for Labour cannot be expected to assign reasons for this failure of the Church to sympathise with them. The fact is enough for them. But we Churchmen may try to analyze the reasons of the failure, at any rate in part. Are they not these? Churchmen have regarded righteousness too prominently as a relation between man and God, and far too little as a relation between man and man. And that is a grave misinterpretation of Christ's teaching. That misinterpretation, that want of proportion, is part of what the Archbishop of Canterbury implied when he spoke lately of "our inadequate

presentation of the message with which we are entrusted." We have failed to emphasize, and to draw the proper inferences from, the religious character, the sacredness—it is no less—of the ordinary relations of life—international, national, commercial, industrial, domestic. We pass over lightly, we practically ignore, the fact, plainly written in the New Testament, that in these relations, conducted in a Christian spirit, lies much the largest part of the service of God. That it is also the most difficult and intricate part is true, and it is on that account that the guidance of the Christian spirit is most needed. We are felt therefore to shirk the precise difficulty which we exist to face, and take the path of least resistance.

From a slightly different point of view we are thought to draw too sharp a distinction between things we call sacred, and things we call secular. We are often, on the other hand, told that "business is business," and that in a tone which implies that there is no more to be said. From the business point of view perhaps that is so, but it is not the Christian point of view, and the conscience of the world no longer supports all that is supposed to follow from that maxim. There are limitations to business being business, as there are to the maxim that "war is war." It is the special, but arduous, duty of the Church conscience to indicate those ethical and Christian limitations, and insist on them. We are felt to have failed in this matter.

Again, as regards sin, it cannot be doubted that the popular verdict outside the Church on what is most sinful differs considerably from ours, and this is a vital point. Our teaching lays the emphasis—at least so they feel—on such sins as coarse and profane speaking, on gambling, and drinking, and the sins of the flesh. These are palpable, visible, "going before to judgment." But they feel that in such an estimate we leave out what seem to them far greater sins, the acquiescing without protest, and even sanctioning and sharing in, the competitive, grasping, inhuman life, which makes money its great aim; the insistence on the claims of property even where they are inconsistent with the claims of persons and life. We

represent in their eyes, and appear to give religious sanction to, the superior claims of property. Their instinctive religion gives the first place to persons and life. Our attitude seems to them detestable, unworthy, and also un-Christian, and they will have none of it. Some of them say plainly that Christ laid most stress on the sins of omission of which we are guilty; they point to His severe judgment of the Pharisee, and His compassion for publicans and sinners; they remind us of His parable of the sheep and the goats. They feel as if we acquiesced in, if we do not attempt to justify, the sacrifice of all that makes human life precious, in the process of acquiring property and power; they think on the contrary that property and power are valuable only because they can procure for human life what makes it precious. Every man is an end in himself, and not only a means, a tool, a "hand."

We must try to understand this, and it is not easy. We find it hard, we say, to teach people repentance when we speak to them of their sins. Do we find it easy when they speak to us of ours? On the contrary our bristles instantly rise; we are indignant, and excuses come readily to our lips.

The wage-earning class have in fact an unalterable ideal of what a Christian society, a Christian nation, would be, and they cannot see in the Church of England, as it is, much promise of help towards attaining their ideal. They note its unbrotherliness and inequalities, its hard, unloving divisions, its unyielding, rival claims. They note also its "classiness." Church society is in their eyes an unlovely thing, as a human society; not a thing of joy and fellowship. A Church, they feel, ought to be a co-operative society for the promotion of godliness and brotherliness; a working society for extending the knowledge of God, and for the betterment of mankind. It does not stand for these in the eyes of the nation, but as a formal, reactionary, individualistic institution, and therefore creates little enthusiasm.

Of course the question is asked by some Churchmen: What is it you really mean? What measures or legislation have you

in view that would create righteousness? The answer is that no legislation can create righteousness; the utmost it can do, is to penalise and thwart unrighteousness. Righteousness is an ideal, a frame of mind, and the Church stands charged with not possessing and holding up that ideal as it should, and not shewing or producing that frame of mind.

Such, then, is the verdict of those outside us; and to it no small proportion of Churchmen are now, it is believed, prepared to plead guilty. They will plead difficulties, they will plead the extreme uncertainty of the results of action, and so on. But at bottom they, like others, are disappointed, and would fain do more for righteousness, if they saw how. They plead guilty, and—extenuating circumstances.

And thus we pass to the second supposition, that the clergy and laity of the Church are now ready to reconsider, and if need be, to change their perspective, and their estimate of wherein righteousness consists. The supposition is partially, it may be largely, true.

And the change is perhaps somewhat easier than it may seem.

For, in the first place, it is plainly more an intellectual blunder of Churchmen than a moral perversity which has obscured this ideal of righteousness between man and man; and it is far easier to admit and correct an intellectual blunder than a moral perversity. It is now seen to be a blunder arising from want of knowledge; the knowledge which enables men to understand and realize in imagination the feelings and aspirations of other classes. This is being remedied on all sides. We know far more about our fellow-men than we did. As a result a certain prejudice has largely disappeared, which attributed simply to class-restlessness, or even worse motives, all aspirations of wage-earners for intellectual and social betterment; the prejudice which used to urge that if such aspirations had material aims, that fact alone indicated a neglect or denial of the spiritual side of life. Churchmen have, in fact, been far from unaffected by recent ideas. As a body they have not yet moved far, but they are much more ready than ever before

to respond when the call comes. And they feel the call is coming, has come.

Churchmen, as well as others, know well that the command to "Seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness" is the only principle that will work; and they also see that "God's righteousness" means true and just and kindly relations between nation and nation, man and man. They are learning to see that this righteousness is being sought in other ways than their own, and by other men; and they are seeing nobleness in these other ways, and wish to be allied with these other men; allied with their longing, not for individual comfort on earth and heaven to follow, but with the unselfish longing for the greater happiness and good of all the toiling, moiling, obscure, suffering humanity around them; and they reproach themselves with having too much kept it out of their own sight and thoughts. That grand hymn of Ebenezer Elliott's makes a fervent response in our hearts also:—

"When wilt Thou save Thy people?
O God of mercy, when?
The people, Lord, the people,
Not thrones and crowns, but men."

For regenerating the nation and the Church on truer, happier lines, both Churchmen and the great social forces outside all organised religion must co-operate. They must see and welcome all that is good in each other, and be willing to believe that what seems bad may yet have good in it, and may serve their common aim.

We shall continue to emphasize different methods. It is ours to lay stress on the message of the Gospel, the Divine Life within, the Light that lighteth every man, faith in God, the desire for holiness; it is theirs to emphasize the need of justice and kindness in all human relations. It is the combination of the two that make "the true worship of God," for that, as our Litany says, consists of "righteousness and holiness of life."

May the call of this National Mission and the great awakening of the war combine these forces for good, which now eye one another with suspicion, organised labour, and the organised Churches, and bring a blessing to the people.

WORK AND PRAYER.*

A SERMON FOR ALL SAINTS' DAY.

By the Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A., late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge; Assistant Master at Harrow.

"But they will maintain the fabric of the world; and in the handywork of their craft is their prayer."—Ecclesiasticus xxxviii. 34.

Next Wednesday is All Saints' Day; and there are at least three ways—besides, perhaps, many more—in which it is worth while to regard it. In the first place, and most obviously, it is the day on which we commemorate all the great heroes of the past, as well as the vast multitude of unnamed people who, all down the centuries, have lived noble and true lives. Again, All Saints' Day should be to us a great inspiration. We know how it can inspire and put heart into a man to remember that he is a member of a great school, or a great army, or a great people. And in the same way it should bring us encouragement and strength in our own efforts to live worthily, to remember that we stand in the midst of a great company of men and women who have held the same ideals before us and have pushed on untired towards the same goal. And thirdly, we learn on All Saints' Day to see more clearly what manner of men we should be.

For, though we may not often use it, and perhaps are not very fond of it, yet that word "saints" should set a pattern for us all. A few weeks ago I was talking to some friends about the National Mission, and one of them said that it was one of the defects of the Church of England, as compared with some other branches of the Christian Church, that it did not make saints. It may be that the charge sounds a true one; but, if it does, I think it is because most of us have a wrong idea of what saintliness means. What does it mean? Some people,

* Preached in Harrow School Chapel on the Sunday next before All Saints' Day.

perhaps, think of saints as in some way associated with flowing robes and a girdle, rather than with our modern coat and trousers. But even if we manage to get away from that mediaeval or primitive picture, still when we speak of saints we think too often of an ascetic recluse, living a life of poverty and renunciation, with a large part of his time given up to devotional exercises, ignorant of the ways of the world, untouched by modern business and politics. We think of a man living, as it were, in a backwater, watching the main current of life flow past him, but not sharing in the experience of it.

Perhaps that kind of saint was valuable once; but at any rate it is not common now-a-days, and—what is more—we do not feel that we want it to be so. Yet, when we say that, it doesn't mean that saintliness is not wanted now, but rather that what is wanted is saintliness of another kind. And in these days, when so many of our old ideas are being found inadequate, and in need of development or restatement, it is worth while for some of us to consider whether this notion of sainthood is not also one that needs to be re-shaped. And so, when my friend told me that the Church of England did not produce saints, I replied with something like what I have tried to say to you now. Life is so much wider to-day than it was a few hundred years ago, the opportunities which it presents are so much more varied, that we must expect to find a greater variety also in the saintly life.

It may occur to some of you that when I claim that the saint is not to be considered as necessarily a man who is withdrawn from the common interests of the world, I am only getting back to the teaching of the New Testament itself. You are right. The word "saint" was a common one with the New Testament writers, but it had no such special meaning. The early Church had its prophets and its apostles; but when St. Paul spoke of saints, it was not of those that he was thinking. He meant by it all those ordinary believers who spent their lives very much as they had spent them before, only as

Christian men and women. It was not new duties that made them saints, but a new spirit in the peformance of the old ones. And to-night, I want you to look back further even than to the New Testament and Paul,—back to that fine old book of Ecclesiasticus from which I have taken my text, a book which is known to many of you, I expect, only by that great passage which is read on Founder's Day): "Let us now praise famous men." Here, in the thirty-eighth chapter, the writer is speaking of wisdom; and he thinks first of the wisdom of the student,—the "scribe" as he calls him,—and says that it is his leisure that gives him the opportunity of gaining it. But then he looks about him, and he sees that after all the majority of men are not students; and what shall he say of them? Can they, too, be wise? He answers, in effect, "Yes, they can; for wisdom is of many kinds." And so he goes on to speak of the wisdom of the farm-labourer, and of the jeweller; of the smith at his anvil and the potter at his wheel. And he concludes with these two magnificent verses:—

> "They shall not be sought for in the council of the people,
> And in the assembly they shall not mount on high;
> They shall not sit on the seat of the judge,
> And they shall not understand the covenant of judgment.
> Neither shall they declare instruction and judgment;
> And where parables are they shall not be found.
> But they will maintain the fabric of the world;
> And in the handywork of their craft is their prayer."

You see he has ended by getting away from the idea of wisdom; he has come at last to speak of prayer,—the stuff, as perhaps we may say, of which saints are made.

Perhaps it seems to you that his final statement comes very near to that old saying which we know so well,—*laborare est orare*, "work and prayer are one." It is a saying that some people do not like; while with others it is extremely popular, because they think that it relieves them of the necessity of "saying their prayers" in the usual way. It seems to me that the objection to it is easy to understand, and is partly justified, for we can hardly deny that there are times when work is done which is not much like prayer. We may put it instead in this

way, that all work can be prayer, but the possibility is not always realised. Then when is the saying true? If all work can be prayer, what is it that makes it so? Shall we not answer by repeating what was said a few minutes ago of the early Christians, that it is the spirit in which it is done, the motive which lies behind it? For prayer means communion with God, in the broadest sense; and work, too, is communion with God when it is the expression of a religious attitude to life. So, finally, we reach the result, that if we are to be saints of this kind, the kind most wanted to-day,—not saints of the mediaeval, stained-glass window type, but saints in our ordinary work, like the farm labourer and the potter of whom the writer of Ecclesiasticus spoke,—taking, along with our sainthood, our full share of all the activities of life, then it is this attitude in our work which matters most. And for the few minutes that are left, let us think about this attitude, and what it means.

Certainly it takes different forms for different people; and they would describe variously their understanding of it. But it would be a grave mistake if we were to object to this, and demand that every man should formulate the religious conception of work in the particular way which seems best to ourselves. There are those, first of all, who are deeply impressed with the conviction that behind and in all this universe of things and thoughts and events, there stands a living God, personal and loving; and this conviction enters into all their ideas and motives. To such men, their work is an attempt to carry out the will of this Person, as much when they are guiding an Empire as when they are blacking boots; it is a bond, a link, a communion between God and man. And so, for them work and prayer are one.

Again, there are others who do not feel so sure of a personal power in and behind all things, or, at least, they do not find that He is continually present to their minds. In their case, the object of their striving may, perhaps, be better described as an ideal of goodness; an abstract, not a personal thing; and it is this that gives the direction to all that they do. But

this, too, is an intensely religious aim, and the work which it inspires is prayer.

But some men do not go so far as either of these that we have spoken of. For them, it is not a complete ideal of goodness that sways them, but only one part of it; and usually it is that part which is forced upon their attention by the nature of their surroundings, or their habits of life. One man is impressed by the social disorders of his time; he sees the rivalries, the cruelties, the class-hatreds that disfigure our national life; and in opposition to such things there rises before him a vision of order or orderliness, working itself out in a society where men love instead of hate; help instead of hinder one another. He has seen one part, and surely it is no small part, of the divine perfection; and he strives to remedy the evil and to hasten the realising of his vision. Such a man is working with God, though it is probable that he does not express it, even to himself, in those words. His motive is a religious motive; and in his work he prays.

Another man will fix his mind on some other part of the ideal. He will work to drive out ugliness from the world, and to promote beauty—beauty of scenery, of architecture, of countenance, of character. And another will order his life by the supreme desire for truth, and will fight against every form of falsehood.

You may call these men one-sided, if you like, and say that it would be better for them if their work regarded more than one aspect of the perfection and completeness of God. But in all of them, and in all other lives in which work is a response to the sovereign claim of some ideal, there is a real communion with the Divine, although, as I have said already, it may not —it almost certainly will not—be called Divine. It seems to me that where the personal element—the recognition of a personal God—is omitted, the motive is less rich in its inspiration. But I cannot deny that these other motives are high and lofty ones, and have real religious value; and I know that the work which they inspire is all one with prayer.

Will you dare to be such saints as these of whom we have thought to-night, whether they are great leaders of men or such as merely do their common work nobly and well, these whom we commemorate on All Saints' Day? Then try to get into your minds the conviction that all work that is worth doing is co-operating with God to make the world better, more according to His will. In your work here it may be so; whether you are preparing a construe, or doing an experiment in the laboratory, or working out a problem in algebra, you may be working for God and with God. And thus in the handywork of your craft will be your prayer.

REVIEWS.

A SELF-CONSCIOUS PILGRIM.*

This book is described by its author as "a personal explanation and an eirenicon." If this be its double rôle, it can only be described as a disappointing production.

In the first place, the history of Mr. Campbell's "conversion" and acceptance of Anglican Orders seems hardly to have been worth expanding into an octavo volume of 339 pages. In point of fact, no conversion took place, and the "pilgrimage" was but a pedestrian affair after all. Sloughs of Despond, Hills of Difficulty, Valleys of the Shadow, were not traversed, or if they were, our author has no word to tell the tale. His Anglicanism, it would appear, is of long standing. For the last fourteen years, we learn, he has missed "the altar"; at Oxford as an undergraduate he "loved the atmosphere of sacramentalism;" was a fervent disciple of the *Lux Mundi* group with their resuscitated Catholicism and tentative Liberalism; was entertained to Sunday dinner at Pusey House—and so forth. And he also has to confess to Nonconformists that "no one of their number has ever touched me at all from first to last." The wonder, then, is not that Mr. Campbell should have become an Anglican priest, but that he could ever have been satisfied to accept the Independent ministry. The actual reason was a very creditable one, for it would appear that at the outset of his career, like Archbishop Tait a generation before him, Mr. Campbell found it impossible to acquiesce in the extremes of Tractarian logic. He could not unchurch his Presbyterian forebears. Tait found his scruple less insurmountable or the logic more fallacious: he took Anglican Orders.

* *A Spiritual Pilgrimage*, by R. J. Campbell, M.A. Williams & Norgate, 7/6 net.

As for the *New Theology*, a portent still more difficult to explain; that weed grew on German soil.

> "From the first day I began my work in Brighton, I began to submit myself to the influence of the Germans, more especially in the sphere of biblical criticism."

"Evil company hath been the spoil of me," complained Sir John Falstaff, and Mr. Campbell has been equally unfortunate. He read Schmiedel, Harnack, Weiss, Pfleiderer, Delitzsch, Bousset, Sabatier, and so on. *Facilis descensus Averni.*

At the same time, though their influence upon him would seem to have been so unfortunate, it occasionally appears that Mr. Campbell's appreciation of these authors was imperfect. The monumental *History of Dogma* gave him "a distaste for the subject," and he speaks (p. 120) of the "sophisms" of Auguste Sabatier, a divine certainly less open than many Anglican writers to that charge.

However, the issue of this perilous section of the pilgrimage was happy enough. With the help of Bishop Gore's apologetics—*The New Theology and the Old Religion*, in particular—the ascent from Avernus proved not less easy than the lapse into it had been. Schweitzer's exposure of the liberal Protestants, and Tyrrell's popularisation of that theme in *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, also contributed to this seasonable consummation. Though Mr. Campbell devotes four pages (124-128) to an ungrateful criticism of the last-named author, who (we are gravely told) "did not attract" Mr. Campbell "personally," and whose work, we now learn, was "almost entirely negative though brilliant." So much for the travels and discoveries of our pilgrim in search of an ecclesiastical home.

And now for the "eirenicon." It is phrased with the cautious unction characteristic of the school to which Mr. Campbell now belongs. We hear an oft-told tale, couched in the well-known *patois*:—

> "Devout minds are hungering for the healing of the sad divisions of Christendom."

This kind of lubricative rhetoric does not carry us very far, but Mr. Campbell has an expedient to propound. It is that Anglicans should recognise the *prophetic* validity of the Nonconformist ministry, while Nonconformists, in their turn, should recognise the *sacerdotal* validity established by the principles of apostolic succession and episcopal grace.

But, at the same time, we are carefully reminded that "Catholics, Anglican and other . . . . cannot run the risk of compromising anything that would endanger the doctrine of the Real Presence." But does the doctrine of the Real Presence depend at all upon Apostolic Succession? "Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them," does not require for its fulfilment the presence of representatives of an episcopally ordained ministry.

Mr. Campbell insists throughout upon the "Catholic" theory of sacraments, quotes Father Kelly's remarks about the shortcomings of Nonconformity in this respect, and enlarges upon the fruits of Catholic piety. This may not be altogether amiss, but there is also much to be said

for Protestant piety, although it takes the form of street preaching, liquor prohibition, and anti-gambling enthusiasm, rather than that of sacramental worship.

As a whole, Mr. R. J. Campbell's book, besides being disappointing in subject matter, bears traces of hurried composition and loose thinking. Its author would, perhaps, do well to renounce speaking and writing on fundamental questions until he has satisfactorily thought out his position. His is the Nemesis of popularity—superficiality.

J. C. HARDWICK.

THE DIVINE IN HUMAN LIFE.*

Dr. Winstanley's little manual on the Incarnation will prove helpful and illuminating to the many who realise that the doctrines of the Christian religion require to-day new methods of approach by reason of the changed outlook and broader education of the modern layman. These concise studies of Christ as Man, Messiah, Son, Lord, and God, in history and experience, presuppose a method of study that is free to criticise the traditions and formulae of the past. Hence it will be found of value to teachers and leaders of such study circles as would be repelled by advanced speculation or uncritical conservatism.

Dr. Winstanley's words about the birth of Jesus will serve as a good example of his cautious, and yet honest and open-minded treatment of uncertain traditions.

> "Jesus was born about 6 B.C., and His birth was a real one, as that of others: 'born of a woman' in God's due season, 'in the fulness of time;' called a man of Nazareth, although Bethlehem was the traditional scene of the Nativity; reckoned of Davidic descent according to the genealogies, whatever may have been made known privately and locally, or believed and taught in later days, concerning the antecedents of that birth, coloured by Jewish or Greek pre-conceptions. And the Infant was named after the leader of the people of old into the land of promise."

Dr. Winstanley's contention that Jesus was in "unfailing harmony" with God's will is indeed hard to reconcile with the traditions about Gethsemane and the cry on the Cross; but all Modern Churchmen will welcome Dr. Winstanley's uncompromising assertion of the mental limitations that are involved in any real Incarnation. Jesus believed Himself to be "the glorious Son of Man—to—be, *the* (apocalyptic) Man," "but it is noteworthy that Jesus is never reported as calling Himself Son of God," although that title is sometimes implied. The title of Logos "was a new revelation, opening up wide vistas for a larger doctrine both of God and man." Dr. Winstanley thus helps us to see modernist principles at work in the writings of St. Paul and "St. John" in the first creative period of the Church. It is for us to carry on the work of the past by seeking for new

* By E. W. Winstanley, D.D. London, S.P.C.K. 1/6 net.

forms of thought which shall be less inadequate expressions of our faith than the old. We cannot finish the extension of the Incarnation to the Eucharist: for us religion "pervading life as a whole . . . . and not the 'divine liturgy' alone is sacramental too." C. Moxon.

SOME LITTLE BOOKS*

Two little books on prayer, uniform in print and binding, by the Rev. Dr. A. H. McNeile, entitled, *Self-Training in Prayer* and *After this manner pray ye*, deserve attention from Christian readers. They are Christian in feeling, modern in expression, thoughtful in teaching.

The Prayer Book Psalter Revised, in accordance with the proposals of a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, will be eagerly consulted by all who desire to retain the Prayer-Book Psalter as far as possible in our Church services. The purpose of the revisers has plainly been to make as few departures as possible from the familiar words and rhythm. Only passages which are hopelessly obscure or glaringly inaccurate in our present version have been amended. Hence many psalms, especially the most beautiful and familiar, *e.g.*, 23 and almost all the Psalms of Degrees (120-134) have escaped alteration. To please all parties in a work of this kind is out of the question. Most of those who know the difficulties will feel that the work has been done judiciously and will desire the substitution of this revised Psalter for the one at present in use in our services. This does not mean that there are not some things in the revised Psalter which we could wish were not there; for instance in Psalm 49, although it is a source of gratification to find in *v.* 5 that "the wickedness of my heels" has become "iniquity at my heels," yet the expression in *v.* 14, "they lie in the hell like sheep," ought not to have been allowed to remain unaltered. However, this omission is forgiven when we find in Psalm 58, *v.* 9, "so let indignation vex him, even as a thing that is raw," has become "with a whirlwind in his indignation shall he sweep them away." Many would, no doubt, like to know what has happened to Psalm 68, *v.* 30. Nothing very exhilarating. However, our Church financiers will be glad to learn that its manifest reference to the collection has not been lost. They still, we are glad to observe, "humbly bring pieces of silver." But who are "they"?

The Book of Jonah—a study in Biblical purpose and method, by Canon T. H. Dodson, is a carefully written exposition of that quaint and beautiful and instructive story. Canon Dodson permits his readers to believe that the fish swallowed Jonah and retained him alive in its stomach for three days, if they feel it to be *necessary* to do so, but he is inclined to think they ought not

* 1.—*Self-Training in Prayer* and *After this Manner Pray Ye*; pub. by Heffer (Cambridge); price 1/3 net each. 2.—*The Prayer-Book Psalter revised*; pub. by S.P.C.K.; price 2/6 net. 3.—*The Book of Jonah*, by T. H. Dodson; pub. by S.P.C.K.; 1/- net. 4.—*British Citizens and their Responsibility to God*, by W. Cunningham, F.B.A.; pub. by S.P.C.K.; price 6d. net. 5.—*The Renewing of Catholicism*, by Sinclair Burton; pub. by Robert Scott; price 2/- net.

to feel it necessary, and he is even disposed to blush for them if they should be so lacking in judgment as to regard *The Book of Jonah* as more historical in its incidents than Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*. Dr. Pusey, we fear, would turn in his grave at such an admission, but he has doubtless turned so often by now that the motion must have become habitual. Canon Dodson appears to regard Mt. xii. 40 as giving the actual words of Christ. If he will consult Dr. Plummer's commentary on St. Mt. p. 183, he will see four good reasons (including its absence from Christ's reply in Lk. xi. 29*f.*) for making him regard it as a gloss or as an insertion by the compiler of the first gospel. Altogether this is a book to be commended, and we are glad to see it is published by the S.P.C.K.

Archdeacon Cunningham's *British Citizens and their Responsibility to God*, being six sermons in preparation for the National Mission, preached in Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, are calculated to repress any eager enthusiasm on the part of Christian Socialists who might be so ill-judged as to urge the Church to particular political action. We are informed that "the clergy who lay down a Christian programme for the country at any moment, are going beyond their commission." We are not sure that the commission of the Christian priest is less limited in scope than that of the Israelite prophet—and there certainly seem to be moments in our national history when the clergy would have served the cause of Christ by laying down a Christian programme with courage and conviction.

The Archdeacon condemns "conscientious objectors" as false prophets because they "insist that the Divine word, given once for all," in the past, "is binding on us for all time." We are afraid this condemnation leaves untouched the large number of conscientious objectors who claim to be guided by the present teaching of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts. Our interpretation of that spiritual voice in our hearts does not agree with theirs. We believe their interpretation to be wrong. We should have been grateful had the Archdeacon gone further into the matter. These sermons will not inspire; but their judicious tone may help to check wayward impulses and to correct over-zealous young men who are for hastening the coming of the Kingdom of God, not duly considering that good intentions need to be directed by sober wisdom based on sound learning.

Mr. Sinclair Burton's book, *The Renewing of Catholicism*, has a preface by Principal Selbie. Mr. Burton looks forward to Christian Unification, and discusses possible methods. Principal Selbie regards corporate re-union as hopeless; but thinks that a cordial willingness to co-operate in the advancement of the Kingdom of God is a necessity for Christendom as well as a practical possibility.

Mr. Sinclair Burton believes that the Anglican Communion, if only it be Christian in spirit, and willing to regard episcopacy as of the *bene esse* not the *esse* of the Church, might prove the rallying point for a vast system of federal union and inter-communion among Christians.

Our author appears to have had a wide experience of different Christian communions, and his volume contains many suggestive propositions and interesting quotations.

H.D.A.M.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

DEATH OF MISS YOUNGHUSBAND.

The Council of the Churchmen's Union has suffered a severe loss in the death of Miss F. M. Younghusband, the first woman to be elected to that body, and one whose wise enthusiasm and generous support we can ill afford to lose. The Bristol *Daily Press* published the following obituary notice:—

"In a recent issue we recorded the death of one of the members of a family well-known in Bristol, whose representatives have in various spheres rendered conspicuous service to the State. The opportunities of women may perhaps equal those of men in number and importance, but their activities are of necessity more withdrawn from public notice. Miss Younghusband upheld worthily the traditions of her family. In the early part of her life she was well-known in London in connection with many enterprises of social and charitable reform. Her work for the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants is still vividly remembered by some who can recall the early days of that excellent institution. Her predominant interests were, however, intellectual rather than administrative, and she devoted herself with an assiduity, which impaired her feeble health, to the composition of a number of books intended to make the past interesting to children. With this object she translated from the German Professor Witt's *Myths of Hellas*, *The Trojan War*, *The Wanderings of Ulysses*, and *The Retreat of the Ten Thousand*. Some of these books have been very successful, and have passed through many editions. The translator has remembered throughout that her foremost duty was towards the language into which she was translating. The books read as if they were English books.

"At all periods of her life Miss Younghusband felt the interest as well as the constraining power of religion. Feeling this she could not but realise the necessity of awakening the minds of children to the religious significance of the events of Jewish and Christian history. The Bible appeals to old and young alike by the simplicity and beauty of its narratives no less than by the sacred associations and appeals with which its words are invested. Too often, however, it is both to old and young a sealed book which they have never learned to open and read. In various writings Miss Younghusband attempted to re-tell, in language which a child would understand, some portions of Jewish history, and also the life of Christ. Unfortunately, when these books were written the popular study of the Bible failed alike in thoroughness and sincerity. The interpreter read his own opinions into the sacred text instead of allowing the text to be his teacher. Miss Younghusband was much alive towards the close of her life to the defects of these books on the Bible, and was engaged almost to the day of her death in re-writing her little *Life of Christ for Children*. The task was a very laborious one,

hampered as she was by almost total blindness, and health which became ever more precarious. She had all but finished her book when death arrested her pen. The body was cremated in London on Thursday, and the ashes will be buried in Freshford churchyard."

Bristol Branch.—The fifth winter session was opened by a special service in S. Paul's Church, Clifton (incumbent, Canon Haigh), at which Canon Streeter preached. He pointed out that as science and philosophy are changing, theology must change also, otherwise it failed to express the truth for the minds of the men of the present. Consequently there was continual need of theological reconstruction and reform. The aim of all constructive reform should be to retain and increase the ethical passion and devotional fervour of the old region, while finding ever better and more perfect expression in intellectual terms of its ideals. There was no future for a Church which would not include the best minds and the best thoughts of the age; but there was also no future for an intellectual liberalism which lacked moral and devotional power.

At the second gathering of the fifth winter session held at the Colonial Institute, the Rev. J. Gamble, B.D., presided, and an interesting paper on the *Acts of the Apostles* was read by Canon J. M. Wilson, D.D. Canon Wilson seemed disposed to accept the more important variant readings of the Western Text as both genuine and authentic, and claimed that they had a most important bearing on the value and interest of the *Acts*. High appreciation of the paper was expressed by those present.

Manchester Branch.—A meeting of this branch of the Churchmen's Union was held at Withington, in Professor Canney's house, on Dec. 1st, at 3 o'clock, Professor Canney being in the chair. A paper was read by Principal Maxwell Garnett, of the Manchester School of Technology, upon *The Psychology of Religion.*

The paper was a distinctly original presentation of that "apologetic" which seeks to shew that in religion lies the satisfaction of certain fundamental human needs. One such need (if humanity were to develop along right lines) was a concentration of emotional interest *not* upon the merely present and particular, but upon the future and the universal. Philosophy would hardly prove adequate to this task without the assistance of Religion; for Philosophy is to Religion as Cognition is to Instinct: *i.e.*, less fundamental, vital, and dynamic.

Principal Garnett's development of this thesis led up to the assertion that the human demand was threefold—for faith, for hope, and for love; thus providing satisfaction in the Christian religious ideal. This "faith"

was not the passive acceptance of unverified dogma, but a readiness to stake life upon certain hypotheses verifiable only by experience. And "love" was that emotion which inspires activity in the service of others, which principle, and *not* the principle of sacrifice or suffering *for its own sake*, was the essence of Christianity.

A vote of thanks was then passed, both proposer and seconder expressing their appreciation of the paper in warm terms.

West London Branch.—The twentieth meeting of the West London branch, the first meeting of the new session, was held on Tuesday, November 14th, at 1, Phillimore Gardens, Kensington, by the kind invitation of Dr. and Mrs. Schofield. There was a good attendance, and the Rev. C. R. Shaw Stewart was in the chair.

The Hon. Secretary announced his resignation with regret, owing to his appointment as Chaplain to the Forces, and the Rev. L. Patterson was unanimously elected as Hon. Secretary of the branch. Mr. Patterson then read a paper on "The Atonement and the Eucharist." He argued that the means of Atonement or Reconciliation was Sacrifice. The object of all sacrifices, Jewish and Christian, was the offering of the soul to God.

The chairman, in opening the discussion, said that the Atonement was the union of the human with the Divine. Ideally, if not actually, God and man are as one.

Rev. E. G. Meyrick Wood, Rev. W. Stewart, Mr. R. Hilton, and others, took part in the discussion.

South Essex Branch.—The fourth meeting of this branch was held at the Chaplaincy, Hornchurch, by the kindness of the Rev. and Mrs. Dale, on Saturday, October 7th, at 3-15.

The Rev. C. J. Sharp, Vicar of Ealing, gave a most clear and illuminating address on the American Prayer Book. He suggested that this book might well be adopted by the Church in England as an alternative use. The revision of the older forms had been carried out in a wise, conservative spirit, and had resulted in some enrichment, in a better use of the ancient prayers, in a better use of the psalms, and in a better use of the Bible.

The points to be specially commended are the greater elasticity, the avoidance of repetition, the provision of alternative groups of psalms, the consecutive arrangement of Sunday second lessoos, the elimination of the Athanasian Creed, and the modification of phrases in the burial and other services which have proved a stumbling block.

An interesting discussion followed, and it was agreed that Modern Churchmen would be doing good service by disseminating some knowledge of the American Book among those who desire Prayer Book Reform.

Scotland.—The parish magazine of Christchurch, Morningside, Edinburgh (Rector, Rev. C. M. Black, M.A.), has very generously, on its own initiative, inserted an attractive advertisement of the *Modern Churchman*, accompanied by a cordial commendation by the Rector. We are most grateful, and commend this action to the notice of many Liberal incumbents, who, while ever willing to help our cause, have perhaps not thought of doing it in this way. We understand that the Rev. H. Handley is acting as National Missioner to this parish, whose incumbent has recently lost his two sons in the War.

National Mission Papers.—The following list of National Mission Papers, Group III., by contributors to the MODERN CHURCHMAN, may be of service to our readers:—

No. 253. *God and Conscience*, by Canon Rashdall.
,, 256. *Development in Theology*, by Rev. C. W. Emmet.
,, 259. *Good and Evil in the World*, by Canon Streeter.
,, 258. *The New Testament*, by Dr. E. W. Barnes.
,, 263. *The Infallibility of Love*, by Prebendary Parsons.
,, 252. *What is Christianity?* by Rev. H. D. A. Major.

Published by S.P.C.K. Price 2/- per 100; or 6/8 per 500.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE TASK OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY CHRISTIAN REFORMERS.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

I.—*Destructive* and *Combative:*

(*a*) To resist the introduction of Mediaeval practices, such as: the worship of the Virgin Mary and Saints, Masses for the Dead, Auricular Confession, Fasting Communion, the Repetition of Prayers, &c., &c.

(*b*) To prevent the degradation of the symbolic and commemorative Lord's Supper to a superstitious and erroneous ceremony.

(*c*) To remove the Creeds of the Oecumenical Councils from our Liturgies.

II.—*Reconstructive* and *Conservative:*

(*a*) To emphasize the spiritual and inward or subjective aspect of Christianity.

(*b*) To preserve the freedom of the individual conscience.

(*c*) To go back to the simple teaching of Jesus: the love of God and of our neighbour, as the true basis and essence of Christianity, and the ultimate analysis of Religion.

These Theses are respectfully submitted to all who are interested in the future of Christianity.

11, *Grove Road, Surbiton, Surrey* JOHN S. DAWES, D.D.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP GROUPS.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMEN.

The Council of the Churchmen's Union have instructed the Secretaries to promote the formation of meetings of the various Christian bodies in suitable centres for the purpose of mutual understanding, exchange of views and united witness. May I therefore urge all to whom this plan commends itself to help in the establishment of groups of ministers and laity for the purpose of prayer as a means to a right judgment upon social problems, and fellowship as a means to a profitable discussion of different points of view connected with Christian belief and practice.

Experience proves that united inter-denominational meetings, which have been held in many places, have great value. If in each centre a committee for united Christian witness in moral matters could be formed, this might well prove the best way of "directing the National Mission to large and living issues."

It is clear that united meetings involve no sacrifice of the strictest Anglican principles since they have been explicitly recommended by a resolution of the last Lambeth Conference of our Bishops.

Marske Rectory, CAVENDISH MOXON.
Richmond, Yorks.

THE DUTY OF SPEAKING OUT.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

Your article in a recent number fills me with gloom, most because I have long realized its truth—the only chance!—the laity behind the Archbishop versus the clergy. The question remains—how is the present largely negative and inarticulate attitude of the laity to be made positive and articulate? One way is by all those clergy, who are dissatisfied, speaking out. I am convinced their number is not small, and work among soldiers has increased it. The dissatisfaction is one quite distinct from their party views.

Their attitude likewise is largely negative and inarticulate. I have been wondering whether they might be induced to come out into the open by having impressed upon them by some special definite effort that it is futile to wait for a lead from the bishops; their difficulties are obvious. Offend bishops! I think not. Many of them would probably welcome their hands being forced. The silent attitude of the dissatisfied renders futile the outspokenness of a few here and there among the rank and file. If all the dissatisfied would come out boldly their mere numbers would carry weight. Many a layman has said to me "Ah, but you are peculiarly broadminded." Am I right in replying—"I doubt it—it is only that so many keep silent."

They do so from what I consider a profoundly and dangerously mistaken policy and motive.

An instance of outspokenness is the footnote to Mr. Egerton Swann's letter in the June *M.C.* "Modern historical criticism makes it doubtful whether Christ did command the celebration of the Eucharist by His disciples for all time."

CHAPLAIN TO THE FORCES.
Salonica.

AN UNFORTUNATE NAME.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

I understand that the Council of the Churchmen's Union recently decided against the proposal for a change of name. This decision will probably be regretted by the majority of the members of the Union. We are undoubtedly losing considerably by the confusion which exists in the minds of the public generally, and of churchpeople in particular, who do not distinguish between the English Church Union and us. Here, in Bristol, we have just experienced the confusion arising from the ambiguity of our name. Such an error is surely the best possible argument for the proposed change, which the Council has viewed with disfavour.

We are clearly a society of Modern English Churchmen. Our conferences at Ripon, Rugby, and Oxford, have all been reported by the London and Provincial Press as meetings of Modern Churchmen. Our admirably conducted magazine appears month by month with its distinctive title. One ventures to believe that outside the Council our members would gladly be known as The Modern Churchmen's Union, or The Union of Modern Churchmen. Should this be considered doubtful, a referendum would soon decide. The initials M.C.U. or U.M.C. would definitely avoid the present confusion of association with the E.C.U.

While it is possible to appreciate the reasons urged by some members of the Council who oppose any change of title, yet the question is surely of very real import to the future progress of our work and aims, and needs to be re-considered by the Council at its next meeting.

H. VICARS WEBB,

Nov. 29th, 1916. *Hon. Secretary Bristol Branch.*

[We understand that an important meeting of the Bristol Branch was recently reported in a Bristol newspaper as a meeting of the English Church Union. A similar confusion has occurred in Yorkshire.——ED. *M.C.*]

THE MODERNIST CATHOLIC, &c.

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

The insight and ability of the original article, and of the various comments which it has elicited, have rendered the subject most fascinating. In itself it is indeed well worth the discussion accorded to it. May I, as another "simple layman," be allowed to throw my stone upon the heap you are raising.

The question may thus be stated. Is it possible that Anglo-Catholic Modernists and Liberal Protestants can continue to act in unison in years to come?

Why not? One must, of course, assume a basic Liberalism in the Modernist. He may be a high ceremonialist, he may adopt the paraphernalia of the Mass, he may take, and afford facilities for, confessions, he may

publicly express a regard for the orthodox Saints, which, to Protestant ears, seems to give them a place in a Pantheon, he may even refer to the teaching and discipline of "*The* Church" very much more often than is agreeable to some of us. These things will not cut him off from the Liberal movement if he does not add to them the belief that Nonconformists are schismatics, and that their ministrations and sacraments do not confer grace and life. To be a Liberal he must believe that the existing varieties of doctrinal opinion within the limits of Christianity, are on the whole, as (leaving out of consideration small exceptions) justified, or at least excused by the uncertainties of the facts, and by the varieties of religious temperament to which the facts and arguments appeal. If I may be allowed to say so, the position of such a Liberal Modernist is well illustrated by the charming and gracious exposition of his views by the Rev. H. Northcote (p. 272) in the September number. The absence of such a minimum amount of breadth is not atoned for by personal indulgence in small and isolated heresies, which in my humble view disentitles a person from considering himself an Anglican Liberal. Though he may call himself, if he pleases, a Modernist, his Modernism at bottom is of a somewhat ancient type.

Liberal Protestant, and Anglo-Catholic Modernist are agreed that the historical study of the origins of Christianity ought to be free and unfettered, and to be governed by the same rules of evidence as the study of the origins of any other religion. They are agreed that the Life of Love and Service is far more important than correctness of theological opinion. They are further agreed that ritual and ceremonies are of secondary moment. Few Liberal Churchmen object, from a religious point of view, to the highest ceremonial, if in accordance with the wishes of the worshippers.

The possible danger spot is a conflict with the Authority of the Church. But that Authority is uncertain and undefinite, and behind it stands the Law. The business managers of our Church (the phrase does not include the Bishop of Oxford), do not want to raise trouble, which might illuminate the poverty of the orthodox intellect, and the culpable failure by the leaders of the Church to look truth in the face. If Liberal and Modernist, whilst still pursuing the steady policy of sap and mine, are wise and suffer fools as gladly as it is within human nature to do, there will then be no trouble. If indeed there were, the Catholic Modernist would be slower than the Protestant to challenge or elude a despotic exercise of authority, but in the long run he would come down on the right side. In the meantime, might not we Liberals wonder whether we are sufficiently tender to our Modernist brethren's weakness for the Church? Do we, in practice, quite recognize that until the truth of to-day is sufficiently tested, and co-ordinated, the truth of yesterday is essential for the multitude, who seek strength and comfort, and may get them in earthern vessels? Do we quite acknowledge the value of the Church as the conservative element in human affairs, as a preservative against premature and therefore harmful reform? If we want, and we do want, to carry with us those, who from artistic or emotional temperament are inclined to the Catholic cultus, and whose views as to the progressive nature of revelation are practically identical with ours, we must let them see that we give due acknowledgment to the utility of the Church.

All is going well. The higher criticism is clearing away the rubbish of ages, and laying the foundations of a better appreciation of the Saviour and His work. The English spirit is responding to-day, as I believe it has never done before, to the message taught on the hill-sides of Palestine, whilst it is shrinking more than ever from the platitudes and make-beliefs of Synagogue and Church. Our business is to bring the Anglican Church into harmony with the deep currents of the time. We shall not do so unless we carry with us the lovers of truth, of the sacramental type of mind, the type helped by external and aesthetic aims and symbols, and reluctant to break with tradition and authority; those, in short, who are I think, the most characteristic and the most perfect productions of the Anglican Church.

T. B. NAPIER.

Reform Club, Oct. 2nd, 1916.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

Members of the Churchmen's Union should be grateful to you for the Article in the MODERN CHURCHMAN upon the "Catholic Modernist and the Liberal Protestant," and for the correspondence which has issued from it.

The original Article rightly eulogizes the old Broad Churchmen for refusing to be driven from the church because their faith would not tally with what was deemed orthodoxy. I should like to point out, however, that theirs was defensive warfare, but now we are face to face with an aggressive war. When Newman endeavoured to show that the statements of our Reformed Church were capable of a Romanist interpretation, Englishmen indignantly regarded it as a breach with common honesty; and now we have those who stigmatize the Reformation as a thing to be repented of in tears and ashes. Surely we may appeal to the example of St. Paul. Though willing to be made "all things to all men" for the Gospel's sake, he speaks in scathing terms of the reactionary spirit of fellow Apostles, and passionately appeals to his converts to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.

Order is Heaven's first law, and it is impossible to conceive how a Church can hold together in which there is not some restraining authority. If there are some things which can be shown to have been set on one side (*e.g.*, Prayers for the dead) without reason, let them be brought back, but it is difficult to conceive how the Catholic Modernist, who desires "to call in authority to guarantee that which criticism has threatened to destroy," can act in concert with the Liberal Protestant unless, as Mr. Preece suggests, he will allow his "Love of God" and "Desire for Truth" to dominate his "Love of the Church" and "Faith in the Church."

I have, however, read with great interest the letter of the Rev. H. Northcote, and feel that in the position which he describes, I must have followed his practice.

CARR GLYN ACWORTH.

*** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.